

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending. Claim 2 was canceled by prior amendment without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-11 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,185,530 to Ittycheriah et al. (“Ittycheriah”). Claims 5-6 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,049,594 to Furman et al. (“Furman”). Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ittycheriah in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,348 to Besling et al. (“Besling”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Ittycheriah describes a method and apparatus that determines potential acoustic confusion between at least one new word and at least a portion of existing words of a vocabulary speech recognition system. *See* Ittycheriah, Abstract. Ittycheriah describes vocabulary expansion using a vocabulary expansion facility 20. A speech recognition system 10 includes a speech utterance pre-processor 12 operatively coupled via an acoustic front-end 14 to a speech recognition engine 16. *See* Ittycheriah, column 3, lines 35-43. Ittycheriah describes that the speech utterance pre-processor 12 receives the speech uttered by a speaker. *See* Ittycheriah, column 4, lines 15-20. Vocabulary expansion in Ittycheriah uses a vocabulary expansion facility 20, which may receive input via an input device 24. *See* Ittycheriah, column 5, lines 20-35.

Independent claim 1 of the present application recites “speaking the vocabulary data to the voice recognition system in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database.” Independent claim 16 recites that “speech data is spoken into the vocabulary database in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database.” It is respectfully submitted that Ittycheriah does not teach a computer-based audio module that is

provided with speech data where the audio module speaks the speech data into the vocabulary database so as to expand the vocabulary database in an automated manner, as recited in claims 1 and 16. In contrast, Ittycheriah merely describes a speech recognition system 10 that receives the speech uttered by a speaker, and an input device 24 for vocabulary expansion. *See* Ittycheriah, column 4, lines 15-20; and column 5, lines 20-25. Neither the speech recognition system 10 nor the input device 24 of Ittycheriah speak speech data into a computer-based audio module so as to expand a vocabulary database in an automated manner, as recited in claims 1 and 16. Indeed, Ittycheriah nowhere discloses these features.

Because Ittycheriah fails to teach each feature of independent claims 1 and 16 it cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 16, or any of their respective dependent claims 3-4, 7-11 and 14-15.

Each of Furman and Besling fail to teach, or suggest, at least the above recited features of independent claims 1 and 16 demonstrated to be missing from Ittycheriah. It is therefore respectfully submitted that any combination of Ittycheriah and Furman or of Ittycheriah and Besling, to the extent proper, could not render any of dependent claims 5-6, 12-13, and 17 obvious.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the respective rejections of claims 1 and 3 to 17 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 based on Ittycheriah, Furman, and Besling is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/797,382
Amendment dated February 20, 2009
Response to Final Office Action of December 23, 2008

Docket No.: 20811/0204770-US0

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claims 1 and 3 to 17 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

It is believed no fees are due with the filing of this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency to Deposit Account 04-100.

Dated: February 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Erik R. Swanson
Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant